

Before the Board of Zoning Adjustment, D. C.

PUBLIC HEARING -- April 13, 1966

Appeal No. 8676 Galen Corp., appellants

The Zoning Administrator of the District of Columbia, appellee

On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously carried, the following Order was entered by the Board at its meeting on April 30, 1966.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER: June 21, 1966

ORDERED:

That the appeal for a variance from the provisions of Section 7206.7 and 7202.1 to permit driveway less than 14 feet in width, or in the alternative the waiver of 2 parking spaces, for a 12-unit apartment building at 1855 Good Hope Road, S.E., lot 59, square 5764, be granted.

From the record and the evidence adduced at the public hearing, the Board finds the following facts:

- (1) Appellant's lot is located in an R-5-A District.
- (2) Section 7202.1 requires that all structures in the R-5-A District shall be provided with one parking space for each dwelling unit.
- (3) Under the provisions of the above regulation, appellant is required to provide 12 parking spaces for the twelve-unit apartment building.
- (4) Section 7206.7 requires that driveways for parking accessory to a structure be 14 feet in width.
- (5) Appellant's lot drops approximately 50 feet from the alley to Good Hope Road, on which the apartment building fronts.
- (6) In addition, appellant states that the grade of the alley was raised  $2\frac{1}{2}$  feet after the apartment building was constructed.
- (7) Appellant proposes to provide the required 12 spaces but two of the spaces would be smaller than 9 x 19 feet, the legal size. As an alternative, appellant proposes to provide 10 legal sized parking spaces.
- (8) Appellant's property abuts a 15 foot public alley.
- (9) No opposition was registered at the public hearing to the granting of this appeal.

OPINION:

The Board grants the alternative method proposed by the appellant, waives the requirements for two of the twelve parking spaces, and accepts the plan for ten parking spaces (Exhibit No. 3).

The Board is of the opinion that appellant has proved a hardship within the meaning of the variance clause of the Zoning Regulations, and that a denial of the request will result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties and undue hardship upon the owner.

Further, the relief requested can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent, purpose, and integrity of the zone plan as embodied in the Zoning Regulations and Map.